



**Judicial Council of California**  
**Court Interpreters Advisory Panel Meeting**  
Administrative Office of the Courts, Redwood Room  
June 10, 2005  
**Meeting Minutes**

<p><b><i>Panel Members Present</i></b> Hon. Eileen C. Moore, Chair Ms. Judy Arasé Hon. Susan M. Breall Mr. Charles D. Brown Mr. Gregory Drapac Ms. Maria Galvez Mr. Lorenzo Hurtado Ms. Sue Mi Jones Ms. Rosa Junquero Mr. Charles J. Légier</p> <p><b><i>Advisory Members Present</i></b> Ms. Susan S. Eadie Mr. Mark A. Arnold</p> <p><b><i>Advisory Members Absent</i></b> Mr. Nestor O. Wagner</p> <p><b><i>Panel Members Absent</i></b> Hon. Dan Thomas Oki</p>	<p><b><i>Administrative Office of the Courts</i></b> <b>Executive Office</b> Ms. Pat Sweeten</p> <p><b>Labor and Employee Relations Unit</b> Mr. Scott Gardner</p> <p><b>Court Interpreters Program Unit</b> Ms. Berta Alicia Bejarano Ms. Patricia Rivera Ms. Elizabeth Tam Ms. Lisa Werblun Ms. Janette Zupnik</p> <p><b><i>Others Present</i></b> Mr. Arturo Casarez, President of California Court Interpreters Association (CCIA) Ms. Katy Van Sant, President of California Federation of Interpreters (CFI) Ms. Odilia Romero, Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales Mr. Leoncio Vasquez, Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales</p>
--	--

## **I. Call to Order**

Justice Eileen C. Moore called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m., and all participants introduced themselves.

### ***A. Assignments***

Ms. Judy Arasé was named timekeeper for the meeting.

Ms. Patricia Rivera and Ms. Berta Alicia Bejarano were named assignment keepers for the meeting.

### ***B. Approval of the Previous Meeting's Minutes***

Ms. Arasé noted that on page 3, item E, sentence 2 states: "The only entity that currently provides certification for translators is the American Translators Association, but the Judicial Council has not approved it". It should specifically state: "...that we now have the first ever Federal certification test in Spanish..."; otherwise it will give the impression the test is for all languages.

Ms. Sue Eadie noted that on page 3, item 6, sentence 3d states: "Ms. Eadie then asked what the status was in the recruitment of an ASL analyst in the CIP Unit, as she is unable to proceed without assistance." The sentence should state: "as it would be difficult to proceed on all the assigned tasks without assistance."

Ms. Arasé noted that on page 7 under "translation tasks force" it should state: "Judge Dan Thomas Oki" not "Judge Thomas Oki".

**Motion.** A motion was made to correct the meeting minutes of March 11, 2005, on pages 3 and 7.

**Second.** The motion was seconded.

**Motion passed.**

## **II. Presentations from the Public**

### ***A. California Court Interpreters Association (CCIA)***

Mr. Arturo Casarez, president, addressed the committee on the importance of retention and recruitment of court interpreters. He proposed that the best way to achieve this is through an increase in compensation. He thought that as the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) function is to advise the Judicial Council on interpreter matters, it should also address compensation issues.

Justice Moore stated that she would look into whether CIAP meetings were the appropriate forum for compensation and pay issues.

### ***B. California Federation of Interpreters (CFI)***

Ms. Katy Van Sant, northern vice president, stated that CFI and Communication Workers of America (CWA) have been in negotiations since last September. Several issues are being discussed at the bargaining table. One proposal concerning salary and benefits would leave Other than Spanish (OTS) interpreters with no benefits and at risk for cuts in pay.

Another key issue is team interpreting. The management team in Los Angeles has agreed to make reasonable efforts to provide a second interpreter for evidentiary hearings longer than 35 minutes. However, other management teams have not yet agreed to this. Ms. Van Sant cited studies demonstrating a drop in interpreter accuracy after 35 minutes. She emphasized the need for the all the courts in California to acknowledge the need for team interpreting, for the sake of the clients who rely on the interpreter.

## **III. Reports from Subcommittee & Task Forces**

Discussion prior to reports:

Justice Moore addressed the issues of scheduling conflicts and task force meetings. She suggested electronic meetings as an alternative to telephone conference calls. She proposed that the head of the task force send out an e-mail initiating the discussion and specifying deadlines for responses from each task force member.

Mr. Charles Brown agreed with the idea of an electronic meeting format and proposed that a telephone conference meeting be held near the final stages of discussion.

### **A. ASL**

Ms. Eadie explained that ASL interpreters come under Evidence Code 754 of the State of California and are not included under Senate Bill 371. She stated that the Judicial Council has approved two different testing entities: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, and California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CCASDHH). Ms. Eadie has been in contact with both agencies to get information on their established continuing education procedures. It was noted that there are currently 39 certified ASL interpreters, 11 of whom are full-time employees of Los Angeles County.

Ms. Eadie stated that she would submit her written recommendations to the panel on behalf of the ASL task force.

### ***B. Higher Learning & Refresher Course***

Ms. Janette Zupnik spoke on behalf of Mr. Nestor Wagner, who was not present. Ms. Zupnik stated that the Court Interpreter Unit is mandated to develop a refresher course for interpreters who are currently on inactive status and returning to work as full-time interpreters.

Ms. Zupnik described a syllabus and a curriculum for a refresher course, suggested by Mr. Wagner. The task force is also hoping to collaborate with institutions of higher learning to develop English classes that would help prepare OTS interpreters of nondesignated languages to pass the examination to become registered interpreters.

Justice Moore advised the task force that she would like them to submit their recommendations in writing for the next CIAP meeting.

### ***C. Translation***

Mr. Brown described the importance of a complete definition of a translator. He thought it would be appropriate to have a statewide testing program established in the courts for certifying both translators and translations. Mr. Brown will put all his task force recommendations in writing for the next CIAP meeting.

### ***D. Discipline, Ethics & Team Interpreting***

Discipline: Ms. Rosa Junquero explained that the role of the task force is to develop a proposed rule of court to address disciplinary issues among the interpreters to ensure delivery of high-quality interpreter standards.

Concerning rule 984 and RUPRO, it was decided that Mr. Mark Arnold will work to reconcile the differences between RUPRO and the desires of the panel. Mr. Scott Gardner will have an OGC attorney designated to work with the task force. Ms. Junquero believed it was possible to have a report completed by September if an OGC liaison was appointed.

Team Interpreting: Ms. Junquero stated that the work plan for team interpreting is to develop guidelines related to the use of team interpretation for long trials. She felt this was an issue that had less priority than the discipline and ethics issues. This topic will therefore be dealt with at a later time.

Ethics: Ms. Junquero explained that the task force is charged with finalizing the revisions to the 4th edition of the *Ethics Manual*. She felt that this issue also required a liaison from OGC. Mr. Gardner will work with the task force to

coordinate such a liaison. The task force will attempt to finalize this task, but it is unlikely to be complete by the September meeting.

#### ***E. Deadlines***

A deadline of August 1, 2005, was set for Ms. Berta Alicia Bejarano to receive from all task forces the various reports and recommendations for the September meeting.

### **IV. Executive Session—Closed Session**

### **V. General Updates**

#### ***A. Training Videos***

Ms. Bejarano provided a review of several videos she has viewed. She felt a portion of each video could be extracted and compiled into one video that would be an excellent resource for the courts. Ms. Junquero suggested creating a satellite broadcast through CJER. Ms. Bejarano agreed to research the situation.

#### ***B. CPS Update***

Ms. Zupnik reported that Khmer and Punjabi were the last languages designated to become certified languages by the 2000 language study. As Cooperative Personnel Services (CPS) was having difficulty finding Khmer Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), Punjabi would probably be developed first, but this was not yet final. Concerns were raised about the written Punjabi test. Ms. Zupnik stated that this issue would be decided upon by the SMEs.

Ms. Zupnik also reported that an oral performance evaluation guide could be found on the CPS Web site. Additionally, by June 30, 2005, there will be an expanded training resource on the site that will contain a sample English/Spanish test.

#### ***C. Language Needs Survey***

Ms. Bejarano explained that a Language Survey is mandated by the California Rules of Court to be completed every five years. The last survey was completed in 2000. The deadline for the 2005 survey has passed. However, a contractor has been selected and discussions for completing the survey are ongoing. The target date for completion of the survey is October 2005.

#### ***D. Discussion on Pay Scale for Independent Contractors/Opt-Outs***

Justice Moore suggested a letter be sent to the Judicial Council, regarding the presentation on interpreter pay by the public presenters. Justice Moore then read her proposed letter.

**Motion.** Ms. Junquero moved that Justice Moore send the letter as written.

**Second.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Arnold.

**Motion passed.**

**Discussion.** Justice Moore said that her only concern is that it is not appropriate to send a letter directly to the Judicial Council. Further discussion ensued.

**Amended Motion.** Ms. Junquero amended her motion: Once Ms. Bejarano has determined whether it is appropriate for the chair of an advisory panel to send a letter directly to the Judicial Council, Justice Moore can send the letter on behalf of the CIAP panel. Otherwise, the letter can be sent to Mr. William Vickrey on behalf of CIAP.

**Amended Second.** The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Arnold.

**Amended Motion Passed.**

## **VI. Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be September 6, 2005, in San Diego.

## **V. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:38 p.m. by Justice Moore.